



WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

July 16, 2013

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:
AS-NEEDED ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING DESIGN
AND/OR DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES
VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS
AWARD CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENTS
(ALL DISTRICTS)
(3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

This action will award and authorize the Director of Public Works, or her designee, to execute consultant services agreements with 11 firms, for architectural/engineering design and/or design review services, to be utilized on various County capital projects.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

Award and authorize the Director of Public Works, or her designee, to execute as needed consultant services agreements with 11 firms; Carde Ten Architects; gkkworks; Gonzalez Goodale Architects; Hammel, Green and Abrahamson, Inc.; HMC Architects; Langdon Wilson International; Osborn Architects; Owen Group; Rachlin Architects; RNL Interplan, Inc.; and Sparano + Mooney Architecture, to provide as needed architectural/ engineering design and/or design review services for a \$1 million not-to-exceed amount each (\$11 million in the aggregate). The consultants will provide their services for various capital projects located throughout the County. The consultant services agreements will be for a one year term commencing upon the date of the first Notice to Proceed. However, where services for a given project have been started prior to the stated expiration date, but not completed by such date, the expiration date will automatically extend solely to allow for the completion of such services.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The recommended actions will allow the Department of Public Works (Public Works) to rapidly obtain architectural/engineering (A/E) services and supplement in-house design and design review to expand the breadth of available expertise and the ability to meet project schedules during peaks in workload.

On February 21, 2012, the Board approved 10 consultant services agreements for A/E services in the amounts of \$500,000 each for a two-year term with a one-year extension option. The capacity of each of these existing consultant services agreements is nearly depleted. Public Works recommends replacing these consultant services agreements with the firms indicated in this letter. This action will continue Public Works' ability to efficiently deliver both design and design review services within desired timeframes on various County capital projects (Attachment A).

When A/E services are required for an approved capital project, a project-specific scope of work and work order will be negotiated and authorized within the contract limitations.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The Countywide Strategic Plan directs that we provide Operational Effectiveness (Goal 1) by improving the efficiency, quality, and responsiveness of County services to all residents. The execution of these consultant services agreements will provide Public Works with access to firms with the necessary A/E design and design review expertise and experience to efficiently and effectively work on County capital projects.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The maximum value of each consultant services agreement is \$1 million (\$11 million in the aggregate) for 11 consultant services agreements.

Sufficient funds to finance work orders for the consultant services agreements are available in Public Works' Internal Service Fund-Capital Project Management Program Budget and individual capital project budgets. Expenditures against Public Works' Internal Services Fund Capital Project Management Program will be reimbursed through billings to Capital Projects.

The recommended action will have no direct impact on the County General Fund.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The standard consultant services agreements, previously approved as to form by County Counsel, will be used. The recommended A/E design and/or design review services were solicited on an open-competitive basis and in accordance with Federal, State, and County requirements. The consultant services agreements will be in compliance with the Chief Executive Officer's and the Board's requirements.

The award of the as-needed consultant services agreements will not result in unauthorized disclosure of confidential information and will be in full compliance with Federal, State, and County regulations. The agreements will contain terms and conditions supporting the Board's ordinances, policies, and programs, including, but not limited to: County's Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) and General Relief Opportunities for Work (GROW) Programs, Board Policy No. 5.050; Contract Language to Assist in Placement of Displaced County Workers, Board Policy No. 5.110; Reporting of Improper Solicitations, Board Policy No. 5.060; Notice to Contract Employees of Newborn Abandonment Law (Safely Surrendered Baby Law), Board Policy No. 5.135; Contractor Employee Jury Service Program, Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 2.203; Notice to Employees Regarding the Federal Earned Income Credit (Federal Income Tax Law, Internal Revenue Service Notice 1015); Contractor Responsibility and Debarment, Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 2.202; and the Los Angeles County's Child Support Compliance Program, Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 2.200; Defaulted Property Tax Reduction Program, Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 2.206; and the standard Board-directed clauses that provide for contract termination or renegotiation.

Data regarding the proposers' minority participation will be on file with Public Works.

The consultants were selected upon final analysis and consideration without regard to race, creed, color, or gender.

The consultant services agreements include a cost-of-living adjustment provision in accordance with the Board Policy, which was approved on January 29, 2002.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The recommended actions are not a project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because they are activities that are excluded from the definition of a project by Section 15378(b) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed action, to award agreements for as-needed A/E design and/or design review services, is an administrative activity of government, which will not result in direct or indirect changes to the environment. We will return to the Board as necessary for consideration of appropriate environmental documentation prior to approving any action that would constitute a project under CEQA.

CONTRACTING PROCESS

On December 4, 2012, Public Works issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to 141 firms, and advertised this contracting opportunity on the County's Doing Business with Us website for as-needed A/E design and/or design review services. A copy of the website posting is attached (Attachment B).

On January 24, 2013, 57 firms submitted proposals. An Evaluation Committee composed of staff from Public Works evaluated each proposal on its technical expertise, proposed work plan, experience, personnel qualifications, and understanding of the work requirements in the RFP. These evaluations were completed without regard to race, creed, color, or gender. Based on the review and evaluation of these proposals, Public Works selected as the 10 most qualified firms to provide as-needed A/E design and/or design review services: Carde Ten Architects; gkkworks; Hammel, Green and Abrahamson, Inc.; HMC Architects; Langdon Wilson International; Osborn Architects; Owen Group; Rachlin Architects; RNL Interplan, Inc.; and Sparano + Mooney

Architecture.

On April 2, 2013, Viniegra & Viniegra Architecture submitted a letter of protest on the grounds that evaluator errors were made resulting in an incorrect score of their proposal and nonselection of their firm. Public Works reviewed the claim in comprehensive detail and responded to Viniegra & Viniegra Architecture on May 6, 2013, that their proposal was correctly scored and that errors were not found.

On April 3, 2013, Lehrer Architects, submitted a letter alleging that irregularities were made during the evaluation process and that the evaluation criteria listed in the RFP did not reflect the evaluation that took place. Public Works reviewed the claim in comprehensive detail and responded to Lehrer Architects on May 6, 2013, that irregularities were not found in the evaluation process and that Public Works would, therefore, not adjust the scores to include Lehrer Architects among the selected firms.

On April 11, 2013, Gonzalez Goodale Architects, submitted a letter of protest on the grounds that evaluator errors were made resulting in an incorrect score and nonselection of their firm. Public Works reviewed the claim in comprehensive detail and responded to Gonzalez Goodale Architects on May 9, 2013, that an adjustment to their proposal score was warranted. This adjustment resulted in an increase to the firm's overall evaluation score tied with the 10th place firm. The RFP allows the County to reduce or augment the number of contracts to be awarded in this solicitation. Public Works recommends contract award to Gonzalez Goodale Architects and increasing the recommended number of firms for award from 10 to 11.

Starting in 2006, Public Works began a program to solicit proposals from firms in the small-, medium-, and large-size categories for the As-Needed Project Management/Construction Management (PM/CM) services contracts. PM/CM firms submitted proposals based on their financial and staff size, competing only against similarly sized peer firms.

Beginning in 2012, in addition to the PM/CM contracts, we expanded our solicitations to include building inspection services and cost estimating services. This strategy ensures that Public Works selects small- and medium-size firms in addition to large-size firms to offer more equitable opportunities to competing firms. Public Works intends to expand this program even further, when feasible, to other as-needed professional services on horizontal projects. As such, we are investigating our ability to do this with the understanding that unique funding requirements and other restrictions may limit our expansion of the program.

We have determined that the services listed in this Board letter would be prime candidates for this program. As such, Public Works will immediately initiate a new solicitation to select additional firms that fit within small-, medium-, and large-size categories to provide these as-needed services.

In order for this program to be implemented now, the 11 firms recommended for award of contract have been advised that there will be a reduction in the contract term originally stated in the RFP. The term for each of the 11 firms will now be for one year.

Public Works has determined that the rates proposed by each of the 11 recommended firms are fair and reasonable.

The 11 selected firms' Community Business Enterprises participation data, required certification, and three-year contracting histories with the County are on file with Public Works.

Public Works has evaluated and determined that the Living Wage Program (Los Angeles County Code Chapter 2.201) does not apply to the recommended agreements.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

These agreements will provide necessary as-needed A/E design and/or design review services to support various County projects in an efficient manner, enhancing the delivery of County capital projects.

CONCLUSION

Please return one adopted copy of this Board letter to the Chief Executive Office, Facilities and Asset Management Division, and the Department of Public Works, Architectural Engineering Division.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'WTF', followed by a stylized flourish and a horizontal line.

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTF:RLR:DJT
SW:RB:zu

Enclosures

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Public Works

ATTACHMENT A

**EXISTING AS-NEEDED ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING DESIGN
AND/OR DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES CONTRACTS**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Uncommitted Remaining Capacity</u>
Altoon + Porter Architects	\$0
Claremont Environmental Design Group, Inc.	\$8,000
Frank R. Webb Architects, Inc.	\$150,000
Gonzalez Goodale Architects	\$365,000
Johnson Fain	\$460
Lehrer Architects	\$0
Morris Architects, Inc.	\$0
Onyx Architects, Inc.	\$0
Pugh + Scarpa Architects, Inc.	\$0
RAW International, Inc.	\$0

**RECOMMENDED AS-NEEDED ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING DESIGN AND/OR
DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES CONTRACTS**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Carde Ten Architects	\$1,000,000
Gkkworks	\$1,000,000
Gonzalez Goodale Architects	\$1,000,000
Hammel, Green and Abrahamson, Inc.	\$1,000,000
HMC Architects	\$1,000,000
Langdon Wilson International	\$1,000,000
Osborn Architects	\$1,000,000
Owen Group	\$1,000,000
Rachlin Architects	\$1,000,000
RNL Interplan, Inc.	\$1,000,000
Sparano + Mooney Architecture	\$1,000,000